SUBJECTS.

65. *Improvements to the Vaikam Town.*

Mr. N. Narayana Pillai (Member, Vaikam Taluk) said that the following public works were necessary for the improvement of the town of Vaikam:—

(1) widening of the road from the western gate of the temple to the backwater landing;

(2) construction of a pier, rebuilding of the shed and construction of a public well at the landing;

(3) filling up the trench over the outlet drain from the Vaikam tank in the interests of sanitation;

(4) improvement of the Ayarkulam, Arattukulam and Mookambikulam tanks; and

(5) construction of public latrines in the town.

Dewan's reply.—None of the works 1 to 4 appear to be really necessary. A latrine will be provided near the backwater.

ETTUMANUR TALUK.

66. *Establishment of a dispensary at Ettumanur.*

Mr. Raman Narayanan (Member, Ettumanur Taluk) said that the necessity for a dispensary at Ettumanur was represented at the last three sessions of the Assembly and the replies given were that the taluk could well be served by the hospitals at Kottayam and Meenachil, 7 and 10 miles from Ettumanur. The Member said that the above distances were calculated from the Ettumanur Taluk Cutcherry and that the hospitals were actually about 16 miles from the habitations of the poor people of the taluk. He therefore prayed that the matter might be reconsidered and a dispensary ordered to be opened in the heart of the taluk.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

67. *Grievances connected with the settlement of the Ettumanur taluk.*

Mr. Chacko Chacko (Member, Ettumanur Taluk) said that the ryots of the taluk were put to much hardship and loss in several ways owing to the settlement having been conducted partly under the old rules and partly under the new rules prescribed in 1904. The grievances of the ryots had been represented at the last three sessions of the Assembly, and the ryots had not received any relief from the Additional Assistants as anticipated, for want of sufficient time to prefer their objections to the latter. There were several irregularities at the settlement. Pazhanilam remissions were not allowed; excesses over registered holdings were treated either as puduvals or recorded as porambokes; jenmam lands were recorded as puduvals and puduvals as jenmam; thiruppuvaram dues were not allowed; in fact, there were

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly